



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,967	02/02/2006	Gerhard Wolf	285132US0PCT	9432
22850	7590	09/29/2010	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				AHVAZI, BIJAN
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
09/29/2010			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/566,967	WOLF ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BIJAN AHVAZI	1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 13-15 and 17-29 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25 and 27-29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 13-14, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on August 04, 2010.
2. Claims 13-14, 18, 20, 22, 24, and 26 are pending. Claims 1-12, 16 are previously canceled. Claims 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, and 27 -29 are withdrawn to a nonelected invention from further consideration.
- 3.. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the rejection of claims in the last Office action is not persuasive and, thus claims 13-14, 18, 20, 22, 24, and 26 stand rejected in view of the Applicant's arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 13-14 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt *et al.* (Pat. No. US 4,775,385) in view of Kuwabara *et al.* (Pat. No. US 5,676,707), and further in view of Andrew Philip Parker (WO 2001/25386).

Regarding claims 13-14 and 24, Schmidt *et al.* teach a process for dyeing leathers, comprising treating the leather with a polyamide-amine (water-soluble cationic polymers) (Col. 6, line 50-52) , follow by addition of anionic leather treatment composition (Col. 8, lines 18-30) in a rotating tanning drum as a uniform rate (Col. 8, line 25), wherein after tumbling, 7% of

commercially available fat-liquoring mixture is added as shown in Example 6 (Col. 8, lines 25-27). Thereafter the dyed leather is dried in air, was mechanically finished (Col. 8, lines 30-31). Schmidt *et al.* do not expressly teach applying the composition to leather by roll coating and/or roll application and/or spray application and wherein the cationic or amphoteric aqueous treatment composition used in process step (a) is an epichlorohydrinamine polymer, the polymer having a weight average molar mass of from $1 \cdot 10^2$ to $2 \cdot 10^5$ g/mol, wherein the concentration of the polymer in water ranges from 5 to 50% by weight based on water.

However, Kuwabara *et al.* teach applying water-soluble resin materials onto the leather by various methods such as a method in which any of the materials formed into an aqueous solution is sprayed by means of a spray gun, coated by means of a bar coater, a roll coater an applicator, a doctor blade or the like, or applied by screen printing, and a method in which any of the materials formed into a film is contact bonded (Col. 5, lines 54-61).

Schmidt *et al.* and Kuwabara *et al.* are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely that of the process for the treatment of leather. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the process for dyeing leathers by Schmidt *et al.* so as to include applying the composition materials onto the leather by various methods as taught by Kuwabara *et al.* and would have been motivated to do so with reasonable expectation that would result in providing decrease in viscosity or in surface tension of soluble resin to achieve easier penetration and further to produce a uniform piece of leather (i.e. retanning) for improvements to the fullness of the leather, the tightness and smoothness of the grain, the break, the levelness and intensity of the dye shade, better uniformity in temper or flexibility, better wettability and additional stability against water and perspiration as taught by Kuwabara *et al.* (Co. 1, lines 30-37)

Neither Schmidt *et al.* and Kuwabara *et al.* teach the cationic or amphoteric aqueous treatment composition used in process step (a) is an epichlorohydrinamine polymer, the polymer having a weight average molar mass of from $1 \cdot 10^2$ to $2 \cdot 10^5$ g/mol, wherein the concentration of the polymer in water ranges from 5 to 50% by weight based on water.

However, Parker teaches a method of treating fabric comprising applying to the fabric a fabric care composition (Page 1, lines 7-9), wherein the reactive cationic polymer is an amine- or amide-epichlorohydrin resin or derivative thereof (Page 5, lines 13-14). Preferably these cationic polymers have a weight average mean molecular weight of from 300 to 1,000,000 Dalton (Page 5, lines 15-16). The preferred epichlorohydrin resins are sometimes referred to as amine-epichlorohydrin resins and polyamine-epichlorohydrin (PAE) resins (the two terms being used synonymously) although these terms encompass both the amine and amide resins and their derivatives (Page 5, lines 18-23). The resins can also have a mixture of amine and amide groups (Page 5, lines 23-24). The reactive anionic polymer is present in the composition in an amount such that the overall negative charge contributed by the anionic groups of the anionic polymer is less than the positive charge provided by the cationic groups of the cationic polymer (such as the amine-epichlorohydrin resin) and any cationic groups in the anionic polymer (Page 7, lines 23-26), wherein suitable amounts of reactive anionic polymer in the composition are in the range of from 0.01% to 35% by weight, preferably 0.1% to 13.5% by weight (Page 7, lines 28-30).

Schmidt *et al.*, Kuwabara *et al.*, and Parker are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely that of the process for the treatment of leather. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the process for dyeing leathers by Schmidt *et al.* in view of applying the composition materials onto the leather by various methods by Kuwabara *et al.* so as to include epichlorohydrinamine

polymer as taught by Parker, and would have been motivated to do so with reasonable expectation that would result in manufacturing various molecular weight ranges polymer by the selection of different catalysts and the use of cross-linking reagents as taught by Parker (Page 6, lines 6-11 & Page 10, lines 30-31- Page 11, line 1).

6. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt *et al.* (Pat. No. US 4,775,385), Kuwabara *et al.* (Pat. No. US 5,676,707), and Andrew Philip Parker (WO 2001/25386) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Buckman *et al.* (Pat. No. US 4,054,542).

Regarding claim 22, Schmidt *et al.* and Kuwabara *et al.* and Parker teach the process for the treatment of leather features as discussed above. In particular, Parker teach the amine- or amide-epichlorohydrin resins may have one or more functional groups capable of forming azetidinium groups and/or one or more azetidinium functional groups (Page 5, lines 26-28) or Alternatively, or additionally, the resins may have one or more functional groups that contain epoxide groups or derivatives thereof eg KymeneTM 450 (ex Hercules) (Page 6, lines 2-4). Schmidt *et al.* and Kuwabara *et al.*, and Parker do not expressly teach wherein the epichlorohydrinamine polymer in the treatment composition in process step (a) has at least two general structural unit (I) and (II) as set forth.

However, Buckman *et al.* teach cationic, water-soluble, amine-epichlorohydrin polymer compositions and to the uses of these polymers in the pulp and paper industry to improve drainage, provide retention of fiber fines, dyes, pigments, fillers, starch, and gum and increase strength. In addition, said polymers are useful as resins in the manufacture of electroconductive paper and the sizing of paper and paperboard as well as the separation of minerals in ore

processing operations (Col. 1, lines 7-12), wherein the reaction products involving polymeric precursor and mono-tertiary amines may be as low as 500 whereas the polymers made with di-tertiary amines may have molecular weights as high as 50,000 to 500,000 (Col. 5, lines 42-46). Buckman *et al.* teach the primary amines which have been found to be satisfactory for the reaction with epichlorohydrin to form the polymeric precursor include aliphatic, alicyclic, and alkylaromatic amines which may be substituted by hydroxyl or chloro groups or contain carbon to carbon double bonds. The aliphatic groups in these amines may be straight or branched chains (Col. 4, lines 38-44). Examples of these amines are given such as isopropylamine (Col. 4, line 56-63).

Schmidt *et al.*, Kuwabara *et al.*, Parker, and Buckman *et al.* are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely that of the process for the treatment of leather. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the process for dyeing leathers by Schmidt *et al.* in view of applying the composition materials onto the leather by various methods by Kuwabara *et al.* so as to include epichlorohydrinamine polymer as taught by Parker or Buckman *et al.* and would have been motivated to do so with reasonable expectation that would result in manufacturing various molecular weight ranges polymer by the selection of different catalysts and the use of cross-linking reagents and further to provide novel cationic water-soluble, amine-epichlorohydrin polymers as compare to polyethylenimines which requires the use of the very toxic monomer ethylenimine which, in recent years, has been described as a carcinogen, and severe restrictions have been placed on the handling of the monomer in commercial and industrial plants by government regulatory agencies as taught by Parker (Page 6, lines 6-11 & Page 10, lines 30-31- Page 11, line 1) or Buckman *et al.* (Col. 1, lines 40-46).

It is held to be a ***prima facie*** case of obviousness since a person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the interchangeability of the element (i.e. functional group) shown in the prior art as taught by Buckman *et al.* (Col. 4, line 56-63) for the corresponding element disclosed in the specification wherein the side chains syntheses merely done by routine experimentation.

7. Claims 18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt *et al.* (Pat. No. US 4,775,385), Kuwabara *et al.* (Pat. No. US 5,676,707) and Andrew Philip Parker (WO 2001/25386) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Ohno *et al.* (Pat. No. US 6,809,147 B1).

Regarding claims 18, 20, Schmidt *et al.* and Kuwabara *et al.* and Parker teach the process for the treatment of leather features as discussed above. Schmidt *et al.* and Kuwabara *et al.* and Parker do not expressly teach wherein the cationic or amphoteric aqueous treatment composition used in process step (a), the ratio of amine units (comprise from 0.5 to 0.8 part of dimethylaminopropylamine and from 0.2 to 0.5 part of benzylamine) to epichlorohydrin units being from 0.8:1.2 to 1.2:0.8.

However, Ohno *et al.* teach polyamine modified compound, including: reaction products of the following (a)-(c): a) aliphatic polyamine (Col. 4, lines 62-64) such as dimethylamino propylamine (Col. 4, line 64), b) a cyclic amine or aromatic polyamine which has at least one NH₂ or NH group (Col. 5, lines 2-4) such as benzylamine (Col. 5, line 11) and reaction products of said aliphatic polyamine (a), said amine (b) and epoxide compound (d) which includes glycidyl ether obtained by reaction of epichlorohydrin with polyhydric phenol (Col. 5, lines 25-

28) wherein (a)=1 mole; (b)=0.5-5 moles; and (NH₂ and/or NH contained in (a) and (b))/(epoxy group contained in (d)) is equal to 1/0.3-0.9 (Col. 5, lines 50-52).

Schmidt *et al.*, Kuwabara *et al.*, Parker, and Ohno *et al.* are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely that of the process for the treatment of leather.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the process for dyeing leathers by Schmidt *et al.* in view of applying the composition materials onto the leather by various methods by Kuwabara *et al.* and epichlorohydrinamine polymer by Parker so as to include the ratio of amine units (comprise from 0.5 to 0.8 part of dimethylaminopropylamine and from 0.2 to 0.5 part of benzylamine) to epichlorohydrin units being from 0.8:1.2 to 1.2:0.8 as taught by Ohno *et al. et al.* and would have been motivated to do so with reasonable expectation that would result in manufacturing various molecular weight ranges polymer by the selection of different catalysts and the use of cross linking reagents, since the reaction between the amines and monoepoxides is usually effected merely by bringing the components together in proper proportions as taught by Ohno *et al.* (Col. 5, lines 50-52).

It is held that a particular parameter must first be recognized as a result-effective variable, i.e., a variable which achieves a recognized result, before the determination of the optimum or workable ranges of said variable might be characterized as routine experimentation. *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977).

8. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt *et al.* (Pat. No. US 4,775,385), Kuwabara *et al.* (Pat. No. US 5,676,707) and Andrew Philip Parker (WO 2001/25386) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Natoli *et al.* (Pat. No. US 5,709,714).

Regarding claim 26, Schmidt *et al.* and Kuwabara *et al.* and Parker teach the process for the treatment of leather features as discussed above. Schmidt *et al.* and Kuwabara *et al.* and Parker do not expressly teach wherein the cationic or amphoteric aqueous treatment composition used in process step (a) is applied only to the crust surface of the leather.

However, Natoli *et al.* teach a method of treating a tanned leather stock (Col. 15, line 58) wherein retanning said tanned leather stock with particles of an amphoteric polymer dispersed in an aqueous medium to produce a retanned leather stock having improved color expression characteristic (Col. 15, lines 59-62). After retanning or, if desired, during retanning, the hide is colored with colorants, such as, acid dyes, mordant dyes, direct dyes, metalized dyes, soluble sulfur dyes, and cationic dyes, wherein the colorants include natural pigments and synthetic dyes that are used to achieve the required color in both the cross section and the surface of crust leather before the finishing step (Col. 2, lines 22-32).

Schmidt *et al.*, Kuwabara *et al.*, Parker, and Ohno *et al.* are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely that of the process for the treatment of leather. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the process for dyeing leathers by Schmidt *et al.* in view of applying the composition materials onto the leather by various methods by Kuwabara *et al.* and epichlorohydrinamine polymer by Parker so as to include the required color in both the cross section and the surface of crust leather before the finishing step as taught by Natoli *et al.* and would have been motivated to do so with reasonable expectation that would result in producing a retanned leather stock having improved color expression characteristic as taught by Natoli *et al.* (Col. 1, lines 60-64).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 08/04/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this case, Schmidt *et al.*, Kuwabara *et al.*, Parker, are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely that of the process for the treatment of leather. Nevertheless, the combination of references is deemed to teach the process for the treatment of leather; the applicant needs to show that his invention is actually different from and unexpectedly better than the prior art, see *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433,434 (CCPA 1977). The applicant is invited to submit any declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 to overcome the rejection based upon reference applied under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as set forth in this Office action to compare his invention product and show the product is actually different from and unexpectedly better than the teachings of the references such Schmidt *et al.*, Kuwabara *et al.*, Parker.

In response to applicant's argument that Kuwabara *et al.* or Parker is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Schmidt *et al.*, Kuwabara *et al.*, Parker, are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely that of the process for the treatment of leather. Schmidt *et al.* teach a process for

dyeing leathers, comprising treating the leather with a polyamide-amine (water-soluble cationic polymers) (Col. 6, line 50-52) , follow by addition of anionic leather treatment composition (Col. 8, lines 18-30) in a rotating tanning drum as a uniform rate (Col. 8, line 25).

Kuwabara *et al.* teach applying the composition to leather by roll coating and/or roll application and/or spray application and wherein the cationic or amphoteric aqueous treatment composition used in process step (a) is an epichlorohydrinamine polymer, the polymer having a weight average molar mass of from $1 \cdot 10^2$ to $2 \cdot 10^5$ g/mol, wherein the concentration of the polymer in water ranges from 5 to 50% by weight based on water.

Parker teach the cationic or amphoteric aqueous treatment composition used in process step (a) is an epichlorohydrinamine polymer, the polymer having a weight average molar mass of from $1 \cdot 10^2$ to $2 \cdot 10^5$ g/mol, wherein the concentration of the polymer in water ranges from 5 to 50% by weight based on water. Nevertheless, the combination of references is deemed to teach the process for the treatment of leather. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the process for dyeing leathers by Schmidt *et al.* in view of applying the composition materials onto the leather by various methods by Kuwabara *et al.* so as to include epichlorohydrinamine polymer as taught by Parker, and would have been motivated to do so with reasonable expectation that would result in manufacturing various molecular weight ranges polymer by the selection of different catalysts and the use of cross-linking reagents as taught by Parker (Page 6, lines 6-11 & Page 10, lines 30-31- Page 11, line 1).

10. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Examiner Information

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bijan Ahvazi, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571)270-3449. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:0-5:0. (Off every other Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Y. Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/566,967
Art Unit: 1796

Page 13

/BA/
Bijan Ahvazi,
Examiner
Art Unit 1796

09/22/2010

/Harold Y Pyon/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796